arXiv:cond-mat/9910407v1 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 25 Oct 1999

Orthogonality Catastrophe and Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking in Double-layer Fermi-liquid-like States

Victor Gurarie[a] and Yong Baek Kim[b]
[a] *Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-4030*
[b] *Department of Physics, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210*
(February 1, 2008)

The double-layer electron system with total filling factor $\nu = 1/2$ can be regarded as two separate Fermi-liquid-like states with $\nu = 1/4$ when the layer separation is sufficiently large and there is no tunneling. The weak tunneling in this state suffers an orthogonality catastrophe and it becomes irrelevant. Using the symmetric and antisymmetric combinations of layer indices as the pseudospin degrees of freedom, we show that there exists the first order transition from the above pseudospin unpolarized state to the pseudospin polarized Fermi-liquid-like state with $\nu = 1/2$ as the tunneling strength becomes sufficiently large.

PACS numbers: 73.40.Hm, 73.20.Dx

The compressible Fermi-liquid-like state at the filling factor $\nu = 1/2m$ in the lowest Landau level has been a subject of intensive theoretical [1] and experimental [2] studies. Upon the experimental observation of the Fermi surface effects of underlying quasiparticles, the Chern-Simons Fermi-liquid theory of composite fermions was formulated and has been successful in explaining many qualitative features of experimental data [3]. The composite fermion consists of an electron and even number, $2m$, of fictitious flux quanta representing correlation holes around the electron [4]. The Chern-Simons Fermi-liquid theory of composite fermions is based on the idea that the averaged fictitious flux quanta cancels the external magnetic field leading to the fermion system in zero effective magnetic field. Recently the truly lowest Landau level theory of the composite fermions was developed and revealed the dipolar nature of the quasiparticles [5–9]. It has been also established that the results in the long wavelength and low energy limit of this theory is equivalent to those of the original Chern-Simons Fermi-liquid theory [5–9].

On the other hand, the half-filled first Landau level (the total filling factor is 5/2) supports a quantum Hall state [10]. This observation leads to the studies of paired quantum Hall states which can be interpreted as the paired states of composite fermions [11–13]. In particular, the spin polarized Pfaffian Moore-Read (MR) state has arisen as a viable candidate which can be regarded as the p-wave superconductor of composite fermions [12–14]. The mechanism for the pairing was attributed to the modification of the short range part of the electron-electron interaction in the first Landau level [15].

The paired quantum Hall states also arise in the double-layer system of total filling factor $1/2m$. If two layers are well separated, the system consists of two separate $\nu = 1/4m$ compressible Fermi-liquid-like states. It is found that when two layers become sufficiently close to each other, there appears a pairing instability of composite fermions which belong to different layers [16]. In particular, so-called (331) state may arise from p-wave pairing of composite fermions with the total filling factor $\nu = 1/2$ [14,17–19]. If the symmetric and antisymmetric combinations of layer indices are used as the pseudospin degrees of freedom, the (331) state can be interpreted as pseudospin unpolarized p-wave paired state of composite fermions [14,18,19]. The tunneling in the (331) state acts like a Zeeman magnetic field in the pseudospin space. Upon this observation, it was suggested that there exists a continuous transition to the pseudospin polarized MR state [14,18,19]. In this case the transition can be characterized by the appearance of finite pseudospin magnetization.

Notice that the single layer spin polarized MR state in the first Landau level may occur due to the pairing instability of spin polarized Fermi-liquid state of composite fermions [15]. Thus it is natural to ask whether there exists the pseudospin polarized Fermi-liquid state of composite fermions in the double layer system in the presence of tunneling when the interlayer interaction is not strong enough to derive the system to a paired state.

Let the layer indices $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ represent the eigenstates of the z-component of the pseudospin. If what tunnel between layers are *composite fermions*, the tunneling simply corresponds to applying a Zeeman magnetic field along the x-direction in the pseudospin space. Thus it splits the energy of ψ_+ and ψ_- fermions; $\psi_\pm = (\psi_\uparrow \pm \psi_\downarrow)/\sqrt{2}$ are eigenstates of the x-component of the pseudospin. Any finite tunneling amplitude will give rise to pseudospin partially polarized states. When the tunneling amplitude becomes sufficiently large only the ψ_- fermion states will be occupied leading to completely pseudospin polarized Fermi-liquid-like state with $\nu = 1/2$.

However, what tunnel between layers are *electrons* and the above picture of the composite fermion tunneling may

not be adequate. Since the tunneling electrons should be represented as the composite fermions with four flux quanta, the tunneling also removes and adds flux quanta in each layer in addition to composite fermions. In the effective field theory description, each tunneling event creates a monopole in the $a_- = a_\uparrow - a_\downarrow$ Chern-Simons gauge field configuration, where $a_\uparrow$ and $a_\downarrow$ represent the Chern-Simons gauge fields associated with the flux attachment transformations in different layers [20,21]. In this paper, we investigate the consequence of the tunneling in the double-layer Fermi-liquid-like states. In particular, we study the effect of monopoles on the tunneling between the layers and the transition from the pseudospin unpolarized state to the polarized Fermi-liquid-like state.

As previously noticed [21,22], the simple tunneling process is suppressed due to the fact that the energy required to create a single monopole diverges (monopoles are confined). This is an example of *orthogonality catastrophe*. Thus the effect linear in the tunneling strength, t, such as the energy splitting of ψ_+ and ψ_- fermions, is absent. The monopoles always appear in the monopole-antimonopole pairs, with the probability proportional to $\exp(-S_{M\bar{M}})$ where $S_{M\bar{M}}$ is the monopole-antimonopole action which depends on the distance between them in space-time. We found that the effect of monopole-antimonopole pairs can be represented by an effective four fermion interaction. By studying this interaction, we found that small tunneling amplitude, t, does not drive the transition to the polarized state due to the suppression of the tunneling events. On the other hand, when t becomes sufficiently large, the effective Zeeman magnetic field is dynamically generated and it leads to the polarized state. Thus we conclude that, the transition between the pseudospin unpolarized state and polarized Fermi-liquid-like state is likely to be a first order transition.

Let us begin with the discussion about composite fermions in separate compressible states in each layer. Here the filling factor of each layer is given by 1/4. In order to get compressible states, we attach four flux quanta to electrons in each layer independently. This can be done by introducing two Chern-Simons gauge fields, $a_\uparrow$ and $a_\downarrow$. The action for the system can be written as (we set $\hbar = c = 1$) [3,16]

$$\begin{aligned} S &= S_0 + S_{\rm int} \ , \\ S_0 &= \int d^3x \ \psi_\uparrow^\dagger \left[\partial_\tau + a_{0\uparrow} + \frac{(-i\nabla + \mathbf{a}_\uparrow + \mathbf{A})^2}{2m^*} - \mu \right] \psi_\uparrow \\ &\quad + S_{CS}(a_\uparrow) \ + \ \{\uparrow \leftrightarrow \downarrow\} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where S_{CS} is the Chern-Simons term,

$$S_{CS}(a) = \frac{i}{2\pi\phi_0} \int d^3x \ \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} a_\alpha \partial_\beta a_\gamma \ , \tag{2}$$

whose role is to attach ϕ_0 flux quanta to each composite fermion, $S_{\rm int}$ denotes the interaction between electrons, ψ, $\psi^\dagger$ are the operators for the *composite fermions*, μ is the chemical potential and $\mathbf{A}$ represents the external magnetic field. If $\phi_0 = 4$, the external magnetic field is canceled by the mean value of $\mathbf{a}_\uparrow$ and $\mathbf{a}_\downarrow$. From now on, we will use $\mathbf{a}_{\uparrow,\downarrow}$ to represent the fluctuations $\delta\mathbf{a}_{\uparrow,\downarrow} = \mathbf{a}_{\uparrow,\downarrow} - \mathbf{A}$.

It is convenient to introduce $\mathbf{a}_\pm = \mathbf{a}_\uparrow \pm \mathbf{a}_\downarrow$ which are related to the symmetric and antisymmetric fluctuations of the electron densities as $\nabla \times \mathbf{a}_\pm = 2\pi\phi_0(\delta\rho_\uparrow \pm \delta\rho_\downarrow)$. Now let us discuss what happens if we allow the tunneling between the layers. The tunneling term is given by

$$S_{\rm t} = t \int d^3x \ \left[\Psi_\uparrow^\dagger \Psi_\downarrow + \Psi_\downarrow^\dagger \Psi_\uparrow \right] \ , \tag{3}$$

where $\Psi^\dagger$, in contrast to $\psi^\dagger$, is the electron creation operator. The fact that the electron consists of composite fermion and four flux quanta can be represented by the following transformation,

$$\Psi_\uparrow^\dagger(x) = e^{i \int d^2x' \ \varphi(x-x')\epsilon_{ij}\partial_i a_{j\uparrow}(x')} \psi_\uparrow^\dagger(x) \ , \tag{4}$$

where i, j are the spatial indices, and $\varphi(x)$ gives the angle between the two dimensional vector $\mathbf{x}$ with respect to the x-axis. Introducing U for the flux creation operator in the gauge field a_-,

$$U^\dagger(x) = e^{i \int d^2x' \ \varphi(x-x')\epsilon_{ij}\partial_i a_{j-}(x')} \ , \tag{5}$$

the tunneling term can be rewritten as

$$S_{\rm t} = t \int d^3x \ \left[U^\dagger \psi_\uparrow^\dagger \psi_\downarrow + U \psi_\downarrow^\dagger \psi_\uparrow \right] \ . \tag{6}$$

The tunneling of the electrons from one layer to another creates a naked flux in the gauge field a_-, in other words, a monopole. If there were no monopole in Eq.(6), we would have concluded that the tunneling just leads to the level splitting between the symmetric and antisymmetric sectors and proceeded from there. Here we need to take into account the monopole terms more carefully.

In order to make a progress, we expand the partition function

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}a_+ \mathcal{D}a_- \mathcal{D}[\psi_+^\dagger, \psi_+] \mathcal{D}[\psi_-^\dagger, \psi_-] \ e^{-S-S_{\rm t}} \ , \tag{7}$$

in powers of t and evaluate the result of the expansion term by term and perform the a_- integral in the presence of monopoles.

In the expansion, each power of $U^\dagger$ and U corresponds to creating a monopole and an antimonopole in the gauge field a_- respectively. Let us show how the monopole contributions can be evaluated following the analysis of [21]. Consider, for example, the following correlation function which appears in the expansion of (7) to the second order in t,

$$\left\langle U^\dagger(x)U(y)\ \psi^\dagger_\uparrow(x)\psi_\downarrow(x)\psi^\dagger_\downarrow(y)\psi_\uparrow(y)\right\rangle\ . \tag{8}$$

This corresponds to creating a monopole at x and an antimonopole at y in addition to composite fermion creation and annihilation processes. Since $U^\dagger$ generates a nonconserved current coupled to the gauge field, naive integration over a_- becomes difficult. The situation can be improved if we introduce the 'monopole' current j_μ which is nonzero along the path $x(s)$ connecting the points x and y and has the following form,

$$j_\mu(x) = \dot{x}_\mu(s)\delta(x - x(s))\ . \tag{9}$$

Here two end points x and y corresponds to the positions of the monopole and antimonopole. Now we can rewrite the correlation function (8) in the following fashion,

$$\int \mathcal{D}a_- U^\dagger(x)U(y)e^{i\int d^3x j_\mu a_{\mu-}} e^{-S_{\rm eff}(a_-)} \tag{10}$$
$$\times\left[\left\langle \psi^\dagger_\uparrow(x)\psi_\downarrow(x)\psi^\dagger_\downarrow(y)\psi_\uparrow(y)\right\rangle e^{-i\int d^3x j_\mu a_{\mu-}}\right]\ ,$$

where

$$S_{\rm eff}(a_-) = -\ln\int \mathcal{D}[\psi^\dagger_+,\psi_+]\mathcal{D}[\psi^\dagger_-,\psi_-]\ e^{-S}\ , \tag{11}$$

and

$$\left\langle \psi^\dagger_\uparrow(x)\psi_\downarrow(x)\psi^\dagger_\downarrow(y)\psi_\uparrow(y)\right\rangle = \tag{12}$$
$$\frac{\int \mathcal{D}[\psi^\dagger_+,\psi_+]\mathcal{D}[\psi^\dagger_-,\psi_-]\ \psi^\dagger_\uparrow(x)\psi_\downarrow(x)\psi^\dagger_\downarrow(y)\psi_\uparrow(y)e^{-S}}{e^{-S_{\rm eff}(a_-)}}\ .$$

Thus the correlation function of Eq.(8) can be written as a product of two gauge invariant quantities. In what follows we assume that the dependence of the term in the square braket of (10) on a_- is weak and can be neglected. This may be a reasonable approximation for fermions which have typically straight line paths. Now we have to evaluate the other factor with U, $U^\dagger$, and the current j_μ.

To do the a_- integral in (10) we need to know $S_{\rm eff}$. One of the terms in this effective action is obviously the Chern-Simons term, while the other term is generated dynamically and related to the density and current response functions of the system with respect to a_- gauge field. The induced term is known in the RPA approximation. Now the effective action in the Coulomb gauge can be written as

$$S_{\rm eff}(a) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\mathbf{q},\omega}\sum_{\mu\nu} a^*_\mu(\mathbf{q},\omega)D^{-1}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{q},\omega)a_\nu(\mathbf{q},\omega)\ , \tag{13}$$

and

$$D^{-1}_{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{m^*}{2\pi}\left(1+i\frac{\omega}{v_F q}\right), \frac{iq}{2\pi\phi_0} \\ -\frac{iq}{2\pi\phi_0}, -i\frac{2n_e}{k_F}\frac{\omega}{q}+\chi q^2 \end{pmatrix}\ , \tag{14}$$

where $\chi = 1/(24\pi m^*)+(1+e^2m^*d/\epsilon)/(2\pi m^*\phi_0^2)$. Here d is the layer spacing and ϵ is the static dielectric constant of the system. Solving the equation of motion

$$\sum_\nu D^{-1}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{q},\omega)a_\nu(\mathbf{q},\omega) = j_\mu(\mathbf{q},\omega)\ , \tag{15}$$

and substituting the solution into the effective action (13) the first factor, $U^\dagger(x)U(y)$, in Eq.(8) becomes $e^{-S_{M\bar{M}}}$ where $S_{M\bar{M}}$ is the action for the monopole and antimonopole sitting at x and y respectively. $S_{M\bar{M}}$ depends on the distance in space-time between the monopole and antimonopole. For example, one can show that

$$S_{M\bar{M}}(|x_0-y_0|,\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{y}) \propto |x_0-y_0|^{1/3}\ , \tag{16}$$

where $|x_0-y_0|$ is the distance in time. We will see that the detailed from of $S_{M\bar{M}}$ is not very important as far as it is finite.

Repeating these manipulations for other terms of the perturbative expansion of (7) in powers of t, we can make the following observations. First, the terms in the odd powers of t in this expansion will involve isolated monopoles or antimonopoles whose action diverges. Thus these terms are completely suppressed. Second, among the terms with even powers of t, only the terms which have equal number of monopoles and antimonopoles survive. For each pair of the monopole and antimonopole, $e^{-S_{M\bar{M}}}$ factor must be augmented. It can be shown that all these terms can be resummed to give an effective four-fermion interaction

$$\tilde{S}_{\rm t} = t^2\int d^3x\ d^3y\ \psi^\dagger_\uparrow(x)\psi_\downarrow(x)\psi^\dagger_\downarrow(y)\psi_\uparrow(y)e^{-S_{M\bar{M}}}\ . \tag{17}$$

Using the Hubbard-Stratonovic field $Q(x)$, we can rewrite the above interaction term as

$$\tilde{S}_{\rm t} = t\int d^3x\ [Q(x)\psi^\dagger_\uparrow\psi_\downarrow + Q^*(x)\psi^\dagger_\downarrow\psi_\uparrow]$$
$$+\ \frac{1}{2}\int d^3x\ d^3x'\ Q(x)\hat{K}(x-x')Q^*(x')\ , \tag{18}$$

where $\hat{K}(x)$ can be determined from $e^{-S_{M\bar{M}}}$. Note that finite Q will provide a dynamically generated *effective* composite fermion tunneling term and it will lead to the transition to the pseudospin polarized state. Without loss of generality, we can take Q to be real. One can show that any finite imaginary component corresponds to choosing an effective magnetic field along a different direction in pseudospin space.

Now we face the theory defined by the sum of the mean field action and the new interaction term (18).

$$S = \int d^3x\ \left[\psi^\dagger_+\left(\partial_\tau - \frac{\nabla^2}{2m^*} - \mu + tQ(x)\right)\psi_+\right.$$
$$\left.\psi^\dagger_-\left(\partial_\tau - \frac{\nabla^2}{2m^*} - \mu - tQ(x)\right)\psi_-\right]$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x \; d^3x' \; Q(x) \hat{K}(x-x') Q(x') \; . \tag{19}$$

We are going to apply the saddle point approximation to the action to determine Q field. The saddle point action is given by

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\rm SP} = - \sum_{\mathbf{k},\omega} \Big[& \psi^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}+} (i\omega - \xi_{\mathbf{k}} - tQ) \psi_{\mathbf{k}+} \\ & + \; \psi^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}-} (i\omega - \xi_{\mathbf{k}} + tQ) \psi_{\mathbf{k}-} \Big] \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \, Q^2 \int d^3x \; d^3x' \; \hat{K}(x-x') \; . \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where $\xi_{\mathbf{k}} = k^2/2m^* - \mu$. After integrating out fermions and minimizing the resulting action with respect to Q, we find the following self-consistent equation (we set the volume of the system to be unity).

$$t \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left[f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}-}) - f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}+}) \right] = KQ \; , \tag{21}$$

where $\xi_{\mathbf{k}\pm} = \xi_{\mathbf{k}} \pm tQ$, $K = \int d^3x \hat{K}(x)$, and $f(x) = 1/(e^{x/T}+1)$ is the Fermi distribution function.

At the zero temperature, if $Qt < \mu$, the self-consistent equation becomes

$$tN(0)(2tQ) = KQ \; , \tag{22}$$

where $N(0) = m^*/2\pi$ is the density of states in two dimensions. Thus there is only the trivial solution $Q = 0$ in this case. This means that partially pseudospin polarized states are not possible. However, if $Qt > \mu$, only the antisymmetric sector will be occupied, thus it becomes

$$t n_{\rm total} = KQ \; , \tag{23}$$

where $n_{\rm total}$ is the total density of electrons. This implies that $Qt > \mu$ can be satisfied as far as $t > t_0 = \sqrt{K/2N(0)}$. Therefore, the fully pseudospin polarized state is possible if the tunneling strength is larger than the threshold value $t_0 = \sqrt{K/2N(0)}$. Since partially pseudospin polarized states are not possible, we conclude that the transition to the fully polarized phase is of first order. One can also show that finite temperature corrections are small as far as $T < \mu$ and the above conclusion is still valid.

As mentioned in the introduction, some pairing instability may derive the pseudospin unpolarized and polarized Fermi-liquid-like states to the (331) and MR states respectively when the interlayer interaction becomes stronger. In view of the suggestion that the transition from the (331) state to the MR state is continuous, it will be interesting to understand how the first order transition found here is replaced by the continuous transition when the paired quantum Hall states are formed.

In summary, we studied the effect of tunneling in the double layer Fermi-liquid-like states. There exists the first order transition from two separate Fermi-liquid-like states with $\nu = 1/4$ to a single Fermi-liquid-like state with $\nu = 1/2$ when the tunneling amplitude becomes sufficiently large.

This work was supported by the NSF grant PHY-94-07194 (V.G.) and Sloan Foundation Fellowship (Y.B.K.). We are also grateful to Aspen center for physics where the present work was initiated. We would like to thank Sasha Abanov, Matthew Fisher, Jason Ho, Ed Rezayi, Xiao-Gang Wen, and Tony Zee for helpful discussions.

[1] For a review, see B. I. Halperin, in *Perspectives in Quantum Hall Effects*, Edited by S. Das Sarma and A. Pinczuk (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1997).
[2] For a review, see H. L. Stormer, in *Perspectives in Quantum Hall Effects*, Edited by S. Das Sarma and A. Pinczuk (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1997).
[3] B. I. Halperin, P. A. Lee, and N. Read, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 7312 (1993).
[4] J. K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 199 (1989).
[5] R. Shankar and G. Murthy , Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 4437 (1997).
[6] D. H. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4745 (1998).
[7] V. Pasquier and F. D. M. Haldane, Nucl. Phys. **B 516**, 719 (1998).
[8] N. Read, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 16262 (1998).
[9] B. I. Halperin and A. Stern, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 5457 (1998); A. Stern, B. I. Halperin, F. von Oppen, and S. H. Simon, cond-mat/9812135.
[10] R. L. Willet *et. al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 1776 (1987).
[11] F. D. M. Haldane and E. H. Rezayi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 956 (1988).
[12] G. Moore and N. Read, Nucl. Phys. **B 360**, 362 (1991).
[13] M. Greiter, X.-G. Wen, and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 3205 (1991).
[14] N. Read and D. Green, cond-mat/9906453.
[15] E. H. Rezayi and F. D. M. Haldane, cond-mat/9906137.
[16] N. Bonesteel, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 11484 (1993); N. Bonesteel, I. A. McDonald, C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3009 (1996).
[17] B. I. Halperin, Helv. Phys. Acta. **56**, 75 (1983).
[18] T.-L. Ho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1186 (1995).
[19] X.-G. Wen, cond-mat/9908394.
[20] X.-G. Wen and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1811 (1992).
[21] Y. B. Kim and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 8078 (1994).
[22] S. He, P. M. Platzman, and B. I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 777 (1993).